UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,837	12/28/2000	Rainer Loesch	2345/17A	1255

26646 7590 04/20/2005

KENYON & KENYON
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER	
FERGUSON, LAWRENCE D	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1774	

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/750,837	LOESCH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lawrence D. Ferguson	1774	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 January 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *28 December 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the amendment mailed January 24, 2005. Claims 6-7 were added rendering claims 1-7 pending in this case.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saaski et al. (U.S. 4,778,987) in view of Forrest et al (U.S. 5,315,129).

Saaski discloses a measuring device (column 1, lines 23-24) providing a high degree of resolution in measuring physical parameters (column 1, lines 36-37). Saaski discloses calibrated measuring device (column 2, lines 67-68) which serves the same function as a scale for technical devices. The reference discloses two or more alternating layers of chrome and silicon (column 18, lines 67-68) with each layer being about 25 and 100 Angstroms thick, respectively (2.5nm and 10nm) (column 19, lines 2-4). Saaski further discloses the silicon being crystalline (column 29, line 20). In instant claims 1 and 6, the phrase, "used for high-resolution or ultrahigh resolution imaging of

structures" is an intended use. a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). Additionally, in claims 1 and 6, the phrase "using one of high-resolution and ultrahigh-resolution imaging method" introduces a process limitation to the product claim. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966. Further, process limitations are given no patentable weight in product claims. Because the reference uses the same materials as applicant and because the first and second material layers are made out of different materials and different thicknesses, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the first and second material layers have different strain and band gaps, absent any evidence to the contrary. Additionally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include third and fourth material layers because the reference teaches *two or more* alternating layers meaning third and fourth material layers can be added to the invention. Saaski does not explicitly disclose chrome being crystalline.

Forrest teaches measuring devices with alternating crystalline layers (abstract and column 1, line 64 through column 2, line 27). Saaski and Forrest are analogous art because they are from the same field of measuring devices. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to include an additional crystalline layer in the measuring device of Saaski because Forrest teaches the crystalline layer can be very thin and give enhanced properties (column 2, lines 1-27).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's remarks to 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saaski et al. (U.S. 4,778,987) in view of Forrest et al (U.S. 5,315,129) have been considered but are unpersuasive. Applicant argues neither Saaski or Forrest are directed to a scale for technical devices which are used for high-resolution or ultrahigh-resolution imaging of structures. In instant claims 1 and 6, the phrase, "used for high-resolution or ultrahigh resolution imaging of structures" is an intended use. a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). Additionally, in claims 1 and 6, the phrase "using one of high-resolution and ultrahigh-resolution imaging method" introduces a process limitation to the product claim. The patentability

of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966. Further, process limitations are given no patentable weight in product claims.

Applicant argues the Forrest reference does not appear to teach or suggest a plurality of one of crystalline and amorphous first material layers and a plurality of one of crystalline and amorphous second material layers distinguishable from the first material layers when imaged using high resolution or ultrahigh-resolution imaging methods. The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). Furthermore, the Forrest reference does not have to teach crystalline and amorphous first and second material layers. In instant claim 1, the phrase, 'a plurality of one of crystalline and amorphous first material layers' is interpreted by the examiner as the first material layer comprising a plurality of either crystalline or amorphous material. This is due to the 'plurality of one of' claim language. This is also the case with a 'plurality of one of crystalline and amorphous second material layers'. Forrest teaches measuring devices with alternating crystalline layers (abstract and column 1, line 64 through column 2, line 27).

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lawrence Ferguson whose telephone number is 571-272-1522. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:00 AM – 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye, can be reached on 571-272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LF

Lawrence Ferguson
Patent Examiner
AU 1774

Rena Dye

RENA DYE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
A.U. 1774

4/18/05